DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 916 JC 920 545

AUTHOR Platt, Gail M.
TITLE Assessing Program Effectiveness: It's a Tough Job, but Somebody's Got To Do It. The Annual Report of the South Plains College Learning Center, Levelland, Texas, 1991-92.
INSTITUTION South Plains Coll., Levelland, Tex.
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 59p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; Community Colleges; *Learning Laboratories; *Learning Resources Centers; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Reading Centers; Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Programs; Self Evaluation (Groups); Tutorial Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Texas Academic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

An assessment of the activities of the Learning Center (LC) at South Plains College is provided in this 1991-92 annual report. Introductory material describes the scope of the LC's operations, including reading and study skills remediation, developmental communications instruction, collegiate instruction in reading and human development, peer tutoring, computer-aided instruction, independent study opportunities, and workshops and seminars for all students at the college. Next, the report presents demographic information on the students served, including their Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) status and scores. Following a section which reports the results of a survey soliciting faculty evaluations of the Center, tutoring activities and courses taught in the LC are reviewed. An assessment of program effectiveness is provided in the next section, which looks at reading remediation in terms of course completion rates, passing rates on exit tests, retention rates, student evaluation of courses, and faculty evaluations. This section also discusses other effectiveness measures, other remedial courses ("Developmental Communications" and "College Success"), and noncourse-based remediation. The next two sections analyze data on the LC Lab and success seminars. Following discussions of program goals for 1992-93 and the effects of TASP implementation, the report concludes with a commentary on the future of academic support activities and remedial instruction at community colleges. Appendixes include data on remedial reading courses, guidelines for non-center-based remediation, and a sample student contract for reading improvement. Additional attachments provide LC statistics, a statistical overview, and verbatim faculty comments. (JSP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346916

Assessing Program Effectiveness: It's a Tough Job, But Somebody's Got to Do It

The Annual Report of the South Plains College Learning Center, Levelland, Texas 1991-92

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. M. Platt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Gail M. Platt, Ph.D.
Director of the Learning Center
South Plains College
Levelland, Texas 79336
July 1992

JC 920345

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the Director of the Learning Center, I would like to thank all those who help make the South Plains College Learning Center in Levelland, Texas, a success. This includes the students who selflessly give their time and talents as tutors; the faculty who recommend students to be tutors, refer students to receive assistance, and serve on our Advisory Committee, offering ideas and suggestions for improvement; the Counseling Staff who share our facility, our philosophy, and our goals; and the administration who support our activities in word and deed, especially our direct supervisor, Mr. Jerry Barton, Dean of Students.

Although all these people play an important role in the operation of the Learning Center, there would be no activities or services to describe and assess without the efforts and expertise of three "Master Teachers" who work in the Learning Center and with whom it is my great pleasure to be associated: Ms. Glenda Shamburger, Ms. Anne Solomon, and Ms. Marla Turrentine. In addition, my thanks go to Mr. Dave Hardy and Mr. Andrew Allison who made the Lab operation go smoothly (more so than ever before) in 1991-92. But, in particular, I appreciate the major contributions of Ms. Deanna Hines, for without her record-keeping knowledge and commitment, it would be impossible to produce an Annual Report or for the Learning Center to demonstrate how well so many things are done for students by the people who work in the department. I also want to thank Ms. D'Nae Dewbre Galloway and Ms. Sheila Tucker, the Learning Center's 1991-92 Scholar Assistants, who assisted Ms. Hines in her data collection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT iv

ANNUAL REPORT

Introduction 1
Students Served: Demographic Information 2
Faculty Evaluation of the Learning Center 7
Tutoring 10
Courses, Assessing Program Effectiveness 10
The Learning Center Lab 20
Success Seminars 26
A Review of Goals 28
Conclusions 31

REFERENCES 37

APPENDICES

A. Remedial Reading Coursework (Semester Data by Specific Courses) 38
B. Non-Course Based Remediation 41
C. Reading Improvement Plan (RDG 000 Contract) 43

ATTACHMENTS

1. Learning Center Statistics 49
2. Overview 53
3. Faculty Evaluation of the Learning Center 54

ABSTRACT

A recent report from the Southern Region Education Board (SREB) charges that very little is known about the effectiveness of remedial programs, even by those who administer such programs (Abraham, 1992). The South Plains College (Levelland, Texas) Learning Center responds to that challenge in this, its Annual Report 1991-92.

An academic support activity, the SPC Learning Center provides reading and study skills remediation, developmental communications instruction, collegiate instruction in reading and human development, peer-tutoring, computer-aided-instruction, independent-study opportunities, and workshops and seminars for all students at the college (enrollment about 3,500). All of these activities are described in the report.

The report also offers an assessment of the Learning Center's operations, a program effectiveness summary on reading remediation (including quantitative and qualitative criteria), and commentary on some of the more significant issues affecting the future of academic support activities and remedial instruction at community colleges in general. Three appendices (with specific information semester-by-semester on the remedial reading curriculum, policies for non-course based remediation, and the Learning Center's Plan for Reading Improvement) and three attachments (with statistics covering a 2-year period, a statistical overview, and verbatim remarks from faculty evaluation) are included in the Annual Report.

Assessing Program Effectiveness: It's a Tough Job,
But Somebody's Got to Do It
The Annual Report of the South Plains College
Learning Center, Levelland

Introduction

A recent report on "College Remedial Studies: Institutional Practices in the SREB States" (Abraham, 1992) issues the following challenge:

> The data in this study suggest that most colleges and universities cannot report with any depth, regularity, or certainty that the academically underprepared students they have freely admitted are getting the kind or quality help they need to have a reasonable chance of completing a degree. Further, these data, or gaps in the data, suggest that it would be difficult for most state and institutional leaders to say that they are informed, knowledgeable, or understand the extent and impact these programs have on postsecondary education within their own spheres of responsibility. (p. 29)

The Learning Center offers this, its Annual Report, in response to this challenge. The Annual Report contains an assessment of the Learning Center's general operation in the 1991-92 academic year, a program effectiveness summary of remediation, and a summary evaluation of activities in the Learning Center's Lab, an independent study/skills development lab.

The Learning Center is an academic support activity providing reading and study skills remediation, developmental communications instruction, collegiate instruction in reading and human development, peer-tutoring, computer-aided instruction, independent-study opportunities, and workshops and seminars for the students at South Plains College, Levelland. Separate sections of the Annual Report detail operations in each of these areas. In addition to the

description and assessment of activities and services provided in the SPC Learning Center, the report offers commentary on some of the more significant issues affecting the future of academic support services and remedial instruction at community colleges in general.

In accepting the SREB's challenge, the Learning Center also invites other entities within the college to formulate program effectiveness plans, to gather and analyze data, to report findings, and to disseminate widely such information for the benefit of all professionals involved in determining the effectiveness of remedial instruction, collegiate instruction, and student support services. Sharing such information will benefit the institution by clarifying standards for success--for curricula, for faculty, and for students.

Students Served: Demographic Information

The Learning Center served 2,138 students (unduplicated count) in the 1991-92 academic year. This represents a 42 percent increase over the 1,502 students served in the previous year.

Fifty-one percent (1085) of the students were male and 49 percent (1053) were female. This is only a slight increase in the percentage of female students served in comparison with the 1990-91 statistics showing that 52 percent of the students served were male and 48 percent female. These numbers are somewhat disproportionate in consideration of the total enrollment at the college with 54 percent (3005) of the students being female and 46 percent (2528) being male (based on fall 1991 student demographics). Therefore, it seems that male students are more likely to request assistance in the SPC Learning Center.

The majority of students (68 percent, 1454 students) served by the Learning Center were Anglo; 23 percent (495) were Hispanic, and 7 percent (151) were African-American. One percent (24 students) were international students. Other categories (Oriental, American Indian, and Other) totaled less than 1 percent. These percentages are consistent with 1990-91 figures and reflective of the total enrollment at the institution with a fall 1991 enrollment of 70 percent Anglo, 20 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent African-American.

In regard to age of the students served, 23 percent (500 students) were 18 or younger; 24 percent (521 students) were 19; 28 percent (598 students) were between the ages of 20 and 25; and, 22 percent (466) were older than 25. Two percent (53) did not provide information regarding their age.

Most of the students served were majoring in technical-vocational programs with 1100 (51 percent) as technical-vocational majors. Only 33 percent (700) of the students were majoring in academic-transfer programs, and 13 percent (276) were undecided. Sixty-two individuals (3 percent) were not yet enrolled in classes at the college and were the result of the Learning Center's outreach efforts to serve potential technical-vocational students as part of the institution's commitment to the Carl Perkins Applied Technical Vocational Act, 1991. The larger number of technical-vocational students served is reflective of institutional enrollment, the support of the Learning Center's programs and services by faculty teaching in the TVO Division, and that faculty's greater interaction with students enrolled in specific programs. System-wide, 46 percent of the students enrolled in the fall 1991 were technical-vocational majors, with 37 percent majoring in academic-transfer programs, and 17 percent being undecided.

The services provided in the Learning Center enable the majority of students served to be academically successful. Seventy-nine percent (1535 students) were successful, earning a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher with a mean GPA of 2.58. This compares favorably with the 1990-91 record showing that 75 percent of the students were successful with a 2.52 mean GPA. Interestingly, students appear to do better in college-level courses (earning a mean 2.71 GPA for college-level only courses) than in remedial courses (compared to a 2.61 mean GPA for remedial only courses). Although this finding may, at first, seem strange, it is consistent with prior research on grades and remedial instruction (Platt, 1991).

Of services provided in the Learning Center, seminars were the most popular in terms of the number of students attending with 2390 attending either the orientation seminar or Success Seminars. However, the most popular service in terms of student visits was tutoring with 906 students making 4,899 visits. Other popular services were reading instruction in the CCC Lab (393 students for 1730 visits), nursing preparation (27 students for 261 visits), and English instruction in the CCC Lab (144 students for 143 visits). [Number of visits is exclusive of class attendance for students enrolled in developmental coursework.]

TASP Status

Thirty-three percent (706) of the students receiving assistance in the Learning Center had passed all parts of the official TASP test with 16 percent failing one or more parts of the official TASP. Less than 2 percent had passed all parts of the Pre-TASP Test (PTT) and almost 11 percent had failed one or more parts of the PTT. A little more than 3 percent (3.41) signed waivers that they were enrolled in certificate programs requiring less than 9

hours of general education (thus, waiving the TASP requirement) and only 5 students signed waivers that they were exempt from TASP by virtue of college credit hours earned at another institution prior to September 1, 1989. In addition, 23 percent of the students were verified as exempt from TASP by earning credit hours prior to September 1, 1989. Furthermore, almost 12 percent of the students served in the Learning Center provided the institution with no documentation concerning their TASP status. In sum, the majority of students receiving assistance in the Learning Center were not subject to remediation as required by TASP with 59 percent having passed the TASP or being exempt from TASP requirements.

These data reveal a significant increase (52 percent) in the number of students passing all parts of the official TASP test over the previous year. There was also a significant increase (almost 5 times as many) in the number of students providing no documentation of their TASP status, and an increase (92 percent) in the number of students enrolling in certificate programs. On the other hand, there was a decrease (37 percent) in the number of students passing all parts of the PTT. Finally, there was still a large number of students claiming exemption from TASP due to hours earned prior to September 1, 1989--a 44 percent increase over the year before.

Interpreting these data requires a good deal of speculation; however, it is likely that recent high school graduates (who in the past would have gone to summer school to earn exempt status from TASP) were taking the TASP test and passing all parts of it; this observation also contributes to explaining why fewer students passed all parts of the PTT. That is, if more recent high school graduates take the official TASP--and better prepared students are more likely to be advised to take the TASP than lesser prepared students-- then

better prepared students are less likely to take the PTT, leaving only at-risk and nontraditional students to take the PTT. Also as more students exit high-school unable to pass the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS test) for a high school diploma, the more likely these students are to forego the TASP and enter a certificate program. The two most surprising outcomes were the number of students still claiming exempt status, a number that was expected to begin to decline in 1991 and thereafter, and the number of students who matriculate at the institution without providing any documentation of their TASP status.

TASP Scores

In 1991-92, SPC students receiving assistance in the Learning Center consistently performed better on all parts of the TASP than did students in the previous year. Moreover, these students performed better than students not needing/requesting assistance. Eighty-five percent (compared to 83 percent in 1990-91) passed the TASP reading test, 82 percent (compared to 76 percent a year ago) passed the TASP writing test, and 76 percent (compared to 74 percent a year ago) passed the TASP math test.

Students during this academic year performed significantly worse on PTT in comparison with TASP; however, this year's performance on PTT was comparable to that of last year. For example, 45 percent of the students passed the PTT reading test (compared to 46 percent last year); 45 percent passed the PTT writing test (compared to 43 percent a year ago); and, 27 percent passed the PTT math test (compared to 32 percent a year ago). Math continues to be problematic for many South Plains College students. [Complete statistics on the population served in 1991-92 are available in Attachments 1 and 2.]

Faculty Evaluation of the Learning Center

In spring 1992, the Learning Center Director sent 150 surveys to faculty through the campus mail; 33 surveys were completed and returned. This 22 percent return rate is typical for surveys of this kind.

The first item on the survey asked faculty to complete the sentence "The Learning Center is . . ." Responses to this item (with the one exception of a totally irrelevant response) were favorable although many of the responses revealed that the respondents were misinformed about the Learning Center or unclear about the Learning Center's role. For example, some individuals felt that the Learning Center included all operations in the facility, including Counseling and Guidance, Special Services, and Student Services; one individual thought that the Learning Center only helped students needing remediation. [For a complete list of verbatim remarks to this item, see Attachment 3.]

The second item on the survey asked faculty to indicate with which Learning Center services they were familiar. The vast majority (94 percent) knew about peer tutoring. However, many were familiar with other services as well with 76 percent knowing about reading courses, 70 percent knowing about Success Seminars, and 64 percent knowing about individual appointments for students to work on study skills, etc. The Lab and the College Success Course were less well-known with 61 percent of the faculty reporting that they were familiar services.

Faculty were asked to indicate how they found out about Learning Center services on the third survey item. Faculty were most likely (56 percent) to indicate that they learned about the Learning Center from Learning Center

faculty; the second most popular source of information was new faculty orientation (42 percent), closely followed by the college catalog and Learning Center brochures (39 percent). Somewhat surprising was the finding that 33 percent of the respondents said they learned about the Learning Center from students; likewise, 33 percent of the faculty indicated that they learned about the Learning Center from colleagues serving on the Student Assistance Center Advisory Committee. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents said that they learned about the Learning Center from other faculty and 21 percent said they learned at student orientation. Two respondents said they learned about services from various fliers announcing seminars, two said they learned from other student services personnel, and two said they called and asked for information.

Referrals were the topic for the fourth item on the survey. Faculty were most likely (88 percent) to refer students for tutoring. However, faculty also were likely (67 percent) to send students for personal appointments and for reading coursework and lab (each at 60 percent). Half (51 percent) of the faculty referred students to Seminars, but only 27 percent had referred students to the College Success Course.

The fifth item on the survey asked faculty to rate their satisfaction with services received by their students. A four-point scale was used with 4.0 being the highest rating. The mean score for the overall operation of the Learning Center was 3.18, well-above the survey mean of 2.0. [Three respondents indicated that they had no opinion.]

Although the survey was anonymous, respondents were given the option of signing their name if they desired more information. Fourteen (42 percent) of the respondents signed their names although not all of them requested more

information. Among those asking for additional information, half were interested in learning about the Lab. Four wanted to know more about the reading curriculum, 3 wanted more information about tutors and tutoring and seminars, and only 2 wanted to know about the College Success Course.

Respondents were also given the opportunity to make comments or ask questions. In general, faculty were concerned about the quick availability and accessibility of tutoring, especially for chemistry and anatomy and physiology courses taken by nontraditional students.

In response to the survey, the Learning Center Director is in the process of revising the brochure describing Learning Center courses and has created a brochure describing the Lab. Letters to faculty who requested additional information also are being prepared. Success Seminar schedules for the fall 1992 semester are being readied as are fliers describing the College Success Course. Moreover, the Learning Center Director anticipates working with the faculty in Biology on providing chemistry and A&P tutoring in the Biology Building in the evenings for the fall 1992 semester. [NOTE: Traditionally the problem has been locating tutors who have had the courses and are still enrolled as students at the college; most students who have completed these courses have finished their studies at the college.]

Tutoring

Fifty-two tutors were employed by the Learning Center in the 1991-92 academic year. They provided 4,597.5 hours of free tutoring to 906 SPC students seeking additional assistance with their coursework. Student visits for tutoring totaled 4,899. This was a substantial increase over the 539 students and 2,500 visits tallied in 1990-91.

Courses Taught in the Learning Center

In fall 1991, the Learning Center served 272 students in remedial courses and 8 in nonremedial courses for a total of 280 students. The 258 students who were enrolled in reading remediation represent a 53 percent increase over the 169 who enrolled in reading remediation the year before (fall 1990). In spring 1992, the Learning Center served a total of 245 students in remedial courses and 10 in nonremedial courses for a total of 255 students. The 210 students enrolled in remedial reading represent an 86 percent increase over the 113 served in spring 1991. Overall, the Learning Center reading program experienced a 68 percent increase in enrollment.

Assessing Program Effectiveness

Reading Remediation: Quantitative Measures

Although a simple headcount can measure program growth, measuring program effectiveness is a more complicated issue with several factors contributing to the difficulty of measuring the effectiveness of reading remediation. First is the problem of selecting appropriate and valid criteria for assessing effectiveness. The SREB study (Abraham, 1992) revealed that only 57.3 percent of 241 public two-year colleges in the region even attempt to measure course or program effectiveness, possibly due to the difficulty of selecting criteria and obtaining data.

Course Completion Rates. Of those institutions which do attempt to measure the effectiveness of remediation, many frequently use the number of students who successfully complete remedial coursework. The SREB study (Abraham, 1992) showed that 70 percent of students successfully complete

remedial reading programs. Locally, 68 percent of South Plains College, Levelland, remedial reading students successfully complete remedial reading programs. However, it should be noted that students are two and one-half times more likely to withdraw from than to fail remedial reading courses at SPC (based on Spring 1992 data).

Passing Rates on Exit Tests. Another possible measure for assessing program effectiveness is to examine passage rates on exit tests; however, this criterion is not widely used. The SREB study (Abraham, 1992) showed that only 46 percent of regional colleges use exit tests, and in reading, 55 percent of the institutions that use exit tests use tests that differ from the placement tests and 38 percent use tests that are locally or institutionally developed. The reading program at South Plains College uses the state-mandated TASP test (or the local version, the Pre-TASP Test or PTT) for placement into remedial reading and requires passing the official TASP test in reading in order to exit remediation.

A serious obstacle to measuring program effectiveness herein lies. Students often do not take the official TASP test upon completing remedial reading coursework; therefore, for this criterion, sufficient data to assess validly the effectiveness of remedial reading instruction are often lacking. Only 6 percent of the students who had enrolled in reading remediation in the fall 1991 attempted the TASP at the end of the fall 1991 or the beginning of the spring 1992 semester (February test date). One exception to this observation is the number of students enrolled in English 038, a remedial reading and writing course, who took the official TASP test; 56 percent of the students enrolled in this course in the fall 1991 took the official TASP test and all who had completed successfully the course also passed the test.

In light of the problem of limited data on TASP performance and the fact that the SREB study (Abraham, 1992) does not provide regional data for comparison, local data must be interpreted with caution. With only 23 percent of all students enrolled in remedial reading programs in the 1991-92 academic year attempting the TASP test, the average success rate of passing the TASP reading test for students enrolled in exit-level remedial reading courses at SPC is 75 percent. This passing rate is comparable to, yet slightly lower than, the rates attained in both the 1989-90 and 1990-91 academic years, those ranging between 78 and 88 percent. (Also, at the time this report was written, scores from the April 1992 test date were not yet available.) [For a description of course completion rates and TASP success rates by semester for specific remedial reading courses, see Appendix A.]

Retention Rates. A third possible criterion for assessing program effectiveness is retention rates for students enrolled in remedial coursework. The SREB study (Abraham, 1992) found that less than 46.1 percent of all responding institutions report retention rates. South Plains College, thus, would be counted with the majority of those institutions which do not report retention rates. However, among those institutions for which such data are available, 50 percent of remedial students are retained whereas 56 percent of nonremedial students are retained (at 111 public two-year colleges).

Examining 33 students who successfully completed the remedial reading and writing course (ENG 038) taught at SPC in the fall 1991 reveals that 94 percent were retained in the spring 1992 semester; their mean GPA for the semester after they had completed the remedial course was 2.16, and 68 percent were in good-standing academically, earning GPAs of 2.0 or better. One

student earned a certificate of proficiency and completed her education at the college with a 2.7 cumulative GPA.

Reading Remediation: Qualitative Measures

Student Evaluation of Courses. At South Plains College, remedial courses are evaluated formally using the same tool used by the institution for all student evaluation of courses. This tool has nine items, the first dealing with explanation of the class format, grading requirements, policies, etc; the second dealing with instructor preparation; the third with instructor knowledge; the fourth with the instructor's ability to explain subject matter; the fifth with adequacy of examinations; the sixth with fairness of examinations; the seventh with accessibility of instructor; the eighth with instructor's willingness to help; and the ninth with the overall evaluation of the instructor. Faculty, as a group at the Levelland campus, receive high student ratings on a five-point Likert scale with 1 being never and 5 being always, thus high ratings reflect high student satisfaction. The mean for the nine items with 6,694 responses for the Levelland campus is 4.52.

The courses taught in the Learning Center, primarily remedial reading courses, received a mean rating of 4.44 for the nine items based on 177 responses. However, the department received higher ratings than the institutional mean on three of the items, including item 9 (the overall evaluation of the instructor). [The other two items with higher ratings were 7 and 8, accessibility and willingness to help.]

Faculty Evaluation. Faculty in the Learning Center also use other tools to solicit student evaluation of courses. One such instrument asks students what they like best about the course, what part of the course is most important, what part is most helpful, what part is disliked, what part seems

like a waste of time, about their textbooks, and their academic intentions. They also are given an opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions. Results of these evaluations generally have been positive.

Faculty also provide informal assessments of the courses they teach. In weekly staff meetings, faculty report on successes and failures with particular methods, approaches, and content. They continuously assess and adjust their teaching to meet the needs of students. One notable product of this kind of informal assessment has been the creation and success of the RDG 035 section for nursing and pre-nursing students. Although the faculty member responsible for the course has reported that it is an extremely demanding course to teach, she has expressed high levels of satisfaction with the course. Furthermore, all of the students who took the course when it was first offered in fall 1991 subsequently were accepted into the nursing program, and the course has received praise from both the Director of the Nursing Program and the Dean of Technical-Vocational Education at the college.

Other Effectiveness Measures

The SREB study (Abraham, 1992) also includes data describing faculty who teach remedial courses as another criterion for measuring program effectiveness. The SREB study suggests that the number of faculty teaching remedial courses, whether they are full-time or part-time faculty, the conditions under which they were hired, their professional credentials, and institutional support for professional development be considered as factors for measuring program effectiveness.

The reading program at South Plains College employs three full-time faculty; the SREB study (Abraham, 1992) reported that at 239 responding two-year colleges, 4.5 faculty were employed to teach remedial reading. This

is typically half of the number of faculty employed to teach remedial writing and math. The study explains the difference in part as the result of "typical enrollment patterns in remedial courses which find more students entering college in need of remedial writing and mathematical assistance than remedial reading" (cited Abraham, 1991), p. 21. Remedial writing and math courses also receive more attention than do reading courses since writing and math courses are prerequisites for the college-level English and math courses required for degrees. Neither reading courses nor proof of reading proficiency is required routinely for entry into the collegiate core curriculum. Moreover, many students recognize (and some faculty acknowledge) that reading proficiency is not a prerequisite for success in collegiate level courses (Platt, 1991).

The fall 1992 schedule of classes for SPC reveals that on the Levelland campus 11 sections of remedial reading are offered; 21 sections of remedial English (out of a total of 67 English course offerings) and 34 sections of remedial math (half of the 68 total math sections offered) are listed. Therefore, at South Plains College, consistent with the trend noted in the SREB study (Abraham, 1992), almost twice as many remedial writing faculty and three times as many remedial math faculty are required to staff those offerings.

Although the SREB study (Abraham, 1992) found that institutions rely heavily on part-time faculty to teach remedial courses with 52 percent of the faculty teaching reading being full-time; all three of the faculty teaching reading at South Plains College, Levelland, are employed full-time. The SREB study also found that in reading, 67 percent of the faculty were hired specifically to teach remedial reading. At SPC Levelland, all three of the faculty were hired specifically to teach remedial reading.

In reading, writing, and math remediation, the highest degree held by the majority of faculty is the master's degree, held by 70 percent of the faculty (SREB study, 1992). All the faculty teaching remedial reading at South Plains College hold the master's degree as a minimum teaching credential; moreover, the faculty employed on the Levelland campus to teach remedial reading also meet Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) minimum requirement of 24 hours of graduate work in a content field as a qualification for teaching college-transfer courses.

In addition, the college supports professional development activities for faculty teaching remedial reading courses. Through institutional funding and federal funds for special populations, faculty teaching remedial courses were able to attend a number of conferences in the 1991-92 academic year. All three of the faculty attended the National Association of Developmental Educators Conference in San Antonio; one faculty member attended the Texas Conference for Academic Skills Programs in Amarillo; and one faculty member attended a Conference for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language in Albuquerque.

Since the Learning Center is not responsible for the writing and math remedial programs, no data on student performance or success rates in these two areas are available for the Annual Report. Unfortunately, the Learning Center is unable to compare its effectiveness with that of the other two areas providing remediation on its campus.

Finally, the Learning Center had hopes that in preparing for the 1992 accreditation visit of SACS, a committee of individuals not aligned with the Learning Center would attempt to evaluate its effectiveness and offer standards for success and/or suggestions for improvement. However, such has

not been the case. In fact, the Learning Center (combined with the Student Assistance Center on the Lubbock campus) received only a single paragraph's mention in the section of the self-study addressing student support services to the effect that academic support services were provided to students. In the section of the self-study describing curricula, remediation was given scant attention with a statement in a draft report to the effect that remedial course offerings were proliferating in response to TASP although there has been no expansion of the remedial curriculum since the advent of TASP. Even though two major academic departments (English and Mathematics) now direct one-third and one-half, respectively, of their efforts towards remediating skill deficiencies, remediation remains an afterthought, and there apparently is little interest in evaluating the effectiveness of remedial programs.

Other Remedial Courses

Developmental Communications. The Learning Center also offers instruction in developmental communications (DC 030, 031, and 032). Taught by an ESL instructor, these courses are designed to teach students the formal English used in professional and academic settings. The courses are required for international students who have not yet passed the TOEFL, and placement testing is available for students interested in the courses.

Six students enrolled in DC 032 in each the fall 1991 and spring 1992 semesters. Two students enrolled in DC 030 in the fall and 4 in the spring; however, these 6 students were concurrently enrolled in DC 032 each semester. The instructor for the classes received enthusiastic support from the Athletic Dept. for her work with the students in the class, many of whom were athletes.

Both students enrolled in the DC 030 class in the fall made As in the course as did 3 of the students enrolled in DC 030 in the spring (One student

withdrew.): 5 of the 6 students enrolled in DC 032 in the fall made As and one student withdrew from the course. In the spring semester, 4 students made As in the course, 1 made a B, and 1 withdrew. Three of the students from the spring class were on the Dean's List at the end of the semester with 3.63, 3.40, and 3.63 GPAs, respectively. The remaining two students from the class had 3.15 and 2.27 GPAs, respectively.

Two of the 6 students enrolled in the fall attempted the TASP test and one passed the reading section with a score of 228. Only one student enrolled in the course in the spring attempted the TASP in February and failed the reading test.

College Success Course. In 1991-92 as in past years, the College Success Course (CSC 031) was offered as a developmental course. Due to changes in the Community College General Academic Course Guide Manual, the course (with some modifications) will be offered as a collegiate-level transfer course in the 1992-93 academic year.

The content of the course will remain much the same although the focus will be on applying principles of psychology. The course provides students with an opportunity to learn and adopt methods to be successful in college and in life. The objectives of the course are to enable students to identify their own strengths and weaknesses, to develop interpersonal skills, especially self-management skills, and to apply their strengths and skills towards academic achievement.

The course is recommended for first-time-in-college students, especially nontraditional students, and for students on academic probation. It is required for students returning to college after being suspended. Seventeen (71 percent) of the 24 students enrolled in the course in the fall

successfully completed the course; 3 made Fs and 4 withdrew. In the spring, 21 (72 percent) of the 29 students successfully completed the course; 2 made Ds, 1 made an F, and 5 withdrew.

Based on the spring data, first-time-in-college students who took the course had an average spring GPA of 3.08 (considerably better than the SPC average GPA of 2.80). Twenty percent of the first-time-in-college students who took the course had a spring GPA of 4.0 (earning an average of 13 semester credit hours). Of the returning students who were on academic probation at the start of the semester, 72 percent returned to good academic standing, earning cumulative GPAs above 2.0. Eleven students improved their GPAs by an average of 1.11 grade points. Overall, students in the course averaged a 2.88 GPA.

Noncourse-based Remediation (RDG 000)

The administration of South Plains College, in an effort to qualify for state funding designated for noncourse-based remediation, developed a policy for providing noncourse-based remediation. Reading, writing, and math (through the Learning Center, the English Dept., and the Math Dept.) then developed placement guidelines for students seeking to participate in noncourse-based remediation. [See Appendix B for a copy of the institution's placement guidelines and Appendix C for a copy of the Learning Center's RDG 000 Contract.]

Four students enrolled in RDG 000 in spring 1992, the first time students had the opportunity to enroll in noncourse-based remediation. Two of the students were successful in RDG 000, both passing the TASP reading test in February 1992 with scores of 237 and 244, respectively. These students both received the grade of A in RDG 000. One other student who received an A has

not yet taken the TASP, but the remaining student who made a B failed the TASP reading test in February (with a score of 203). Therefore, the success rate of RDG 000 is 50 percent.

This pass rate is lower than the overall pass rate for students enrolled in course-based reading remediation, and there are serious reservations about noncourse-based remediation and its effectiveness as an alternative to course-based remediation for at-risk students at South Plains College, Levelland. First, the number of students who qualify for participation in any noncourse-based remediation is necessarily limited; for example, based on data regarding all SPC students who had taken the official TASP test in 1990, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board projected that a very small percentage of students would qualify for noncourse-based remediation in reading, writing, or math. Second, although pass rates for RDG 000 are low, they are significantly better than the pass rates for ENG 000 (37 percent) and MTH 000 (36 percent). Therefore, it seems that noncourse-based remediation is a record-keeper's solution to providing numbers for state reimbursement and has very little to do with effective remediation for the great majority of students. Only if students who participate in RDG 000 meet the stringent placement criteria can noncourse-based remediation in reading be considered a viable option for a very select group of students.

The Learning Center Lab

In addition to the academic support services traditionally available in the Learning Center's Lab (including computer-aided-instruction with drills and tutorials for Apple IIe computers, instructional videos, audio cassette materials, and text materials), the 1991-92 academic year saw the expansion of

services to include a full-curriculum of computer-aided-instruction with the CCC and its 10 IBM stations. The CCC employs a sophisticated, performance-based approach, allowing students to make rapid academic gains. Students work at a level of instruction based on their actual performance with the system producing instruction continuously customized for students' individual needs. The system automatically advances students through instruction as soon as mastery of skills is achieved.

The CCC also offers a complete curriculum of courses, including Math Concepts and Skills, Problem-Solving, Math Enrichment, Algebra Topics, Reading Readiness, Initial Reading, Basic Reading, Reader's Workshop, Critical Reading Skills, Reading Network, Language Arts, Writing: Process and Skills, Fundamentals of English, Writer's Express, ESL, Adult Language Skills, Keyboard Skills, Survival Skills, Computer Literacy, Practical Reading Skills, and GED-Preparation, among others. Learning Center faculty have discovered that Critical Reading Skills, GED-Preparation (for reading), Fundamentals of English, and Algebra Topics are good preparation courses for students who have failed the TASP or for those who have not yet taken the TASP test.

The CCC system was not installed in the Learning Center Lab until late in the fall semester; therefore, students had limited opportunity to work on the system in the fall. Nonetheless, a total of 267 students enrolled and participated in courses on the CCC in the 1991-92 academic year; 98 students enrolled in courses, but did not participate.

A sampling of 36 technical-vocational students enrolled in various "strands" courses reveals that students spent an average of 2.96 hours on the system and gained an average of 2 months improvement in their skills. In other words, for the amount of improvement that would normally require one month,

students can accomplish in 90 minutes on the CCC. [NOTE: The CCC has two kinds of courses, Stands and Lessons. Strands courses are based on grade-level criteria whereas Lessons courses are based on skills criteria; in general, Lessons courses are more advanced.]

Using data supplied by the Learning Center Lab Instructor, there were a total of 909 student visits to the Lab between November 19, 1991 and April 7, 1992 for an average of 12.6 visits per day. Furthermore, there was an average of 24.5 visits per day on Tuesdays and Thursdays from February 2 through April 7, and there were 36 occasions when all 10 IBM stations were in simultaneous use.

Lab Evaluation (General)

The week before Spring Break, the Lab Instructor administered a Lab Evaluation to 112 students attending Lab. The forms were anonymous and asked that students rate the Lab environment, the instructors, the suitability of materials, the effectiveness of materials, and the quality of feedback they received in the Lab. The forms also asked students to provide some descriptive information and surveyed their opinions regarding the accessibility of the Lab. Students also were given an opportunity for open comment.

Overall, the evaluation results were positive. On a rating scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the best possible score, environment was rated a 1.96; the effectiveness of materials received a 2.00 rating; the suitability of materials received a 2.16, and the quality of feedback received the lowest rating, a 2.22 (which was still above the scale mean). The instructors received the highest rating of 1.68. All ratings were above the mean, so the data can be interpreted as indicating that students feel the Lab is above

average, with instructors, environment, and effectiveness of materials being well-above average.

One hundred of the 112 students said that they were attending Lab to meet course requirements, but 52 percent said that they would use the Lab even if it were not required. Of those students surveyed, 15 estimated that they had spent between 6 and 10 hours in Lab; 28 estimated between 11 and 20 hours; and, 9 students said they had spent more than 20 hours in the Lab.

Eighty-seven percent of the students indicated that they thought the hours available for Lab use were sufficient, although 17 students wanted the Lab open at other hours, with 1 student requesting that the Lab be open before 8:30 in the morning, 3 students asking that it remain open during the lunch hour, 10 wanting the Lab to remain open after 4:00 pm, and 3 students interested in weekend hours. Lab operation is limited by the funding available to keep it staffed with the Lab Instructor approved to work only 30 hours a week from February 1 until May 1, 1992, and 17 hours a week in the fall 1991.

Student comments ranged from remarks about noise (with some thinking it too noisy and some too quiet) to temperature (too cold) to the comfort of the chairs (not realizing that the chairs are adjustable) to requests for more accessibility. Several comments centered on the help students had found in the Lab, such as, "Everything is done well. There needs to be no changes . . .," "The Learning Center has done very well in helping me and I will return to this Lab as often as I can from now on," and "The Lab is a great place to learn what you need to know to help you get ready for the TASP test and a whole lot more. . . ."

Based on the evaluation results, the Lab Instructor offered several recommendations; they were: (a) to spruce up the walls in the Lab with posters, etc.; (b) to let students know that the chairs are adjustable; (c) to keep the room quieter (although not too quiet); (d) to lengthen headphone cords; (e) to encourage students to ask for help when they have trouble or questions, and (f) to share survey information with students. Some of the suggestions were implemented immediately and others are being addressed presently.

Lab for TASP Preparation

Another group of 18 students who had used the Lab were asked to respond to a questionaire regarding the specific use of the Lab for TASP preparation. These students were asked to respond anonymously to a 10-item questionnaire asking them if they had taken the TASP test and then to rate several factors using a 6-point Likert scale with 1 being very good, 2 good, 3 somewhat, 4 poor, 5 very poor, and 6 unable to judge. Eleven of the students responding to the survey had taken TASP and 7 had not. These data reveal that students again rate the attentiveness and personality of the Lab instructor (and attendant) and the usefulness of feedback concerning their reading skills highest (1.17 rating); the usefulness of materials received the next highest rating (1.19), closely followed by the usefulness in college coursework of the skills taught (1.20). Receiving somewhat lower ratings were students' understanding of what they were to work on in the Lab (1.41) and the Lab environment (1.44). The lowest rating (1.75) was given to the reading faculty and Lab instructor for explaining the TASP reading test. However, as in the general survey, all these responses were well above the 3.0 survey mean.

This specialized survey also asked students to self-rate their skills before they started work in the Lab compared to their skills after working in the Lab. Using the same 6-point Likert scale, students rated their reading skills before working in the Lab as 3.17 and after working in the Lab as 2.06 (with 2 students reporting that they were unable to judge their skills after working in the Lab). Generally, student comments were requests for more availability of computers and Lab hours.

Other Materials

Although the CCC became the premier service offered in the Learning Center Lab, the Lab continues to offer an array of support services. Two IBM computers were upgraded to provide word processing opportunities for students using WordPerfect and Leading Edge Software and a Grammatick program for analyzing composition and syntactical proficiency.

Numerous video tapes also were acquired, including tapes on reading strategies, stress management, time management, math anxiety, composition ("The Elements of Style" based on White and Strunk's classic text), proofreading and editing skills, Joyce Carol Oates on writing, self-esteem, assertiveness, negotiation, sexual harrassment, college survival series (9 tapes including ones on stress management, time management, and test-taking strategies), and management and leadership skills for women. Tutor training tapes (4 tapes), and a series of professional development tapes (a total of 10 tapes) for faculty use on critical thinking skills were added to the Lab collection.

Several sets of books were purchased for the lab, including a text on math anxiety to accompany the videotape, a communications skills text, a critical thinking text, an English handbook, and copies of the New Official

TASP Study Guide. Copies of Pass the TASP and several other reading texts were acquired.

A number of audio cassettes were obtained, most for student use but some for the professional development of faculty. For student use, business etiquette, the One-Minute Manager, and public speaking tapes were acquired. For faculty use, a series of tapes from the National Association of Developmental Educators Conference were purchased (a total of 8 audio tapes).

The Director of the Learning Center and the Learning Center Secretary also have created over 34 handouts on specialized topics, ranging from preparing for the TASP test and nursing program entrance tests to writing essays and research papers. These handouts are available outside the Learning Center office in the tutoring area. They also are made available to Student Services staff working in the Student Assistance Center.

Success Seminars

Over 1059 students attended the 19 Success Seminars offered by the Learning Center in the 1991-92 academic year. Sixty-one students attending 5 different seminars (on test-taking, self-management, TASP information, and TASP preparation in reading and writing) in spring 1992 were asked to fill out anonymous evaluation forms to provide feedback concerning the seminars.

The surveys had 5 items and a space for students to make suggestions and/or comments. The five items required that students respond using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being no opinion, 2 poor, 3 fair, 4 good, and 5 excellent.

The first item asked students to rate the consistency of material presented with its advertising ("The information covered in this seminar met

my expectations (i.e., was consistent with the advertising about it."). Students' rating of this item was lowest among the five items with a mean of 3.98.

The second item asked students to rate the usefulness of the information presented. Students' response to this item was 4.32 (mean). A similar response was given to item 5 which asked students for an overall rating of the seminar (4.34 mean).

The third item asked students to rate the clear communication of information by the presenter. Students rated this item somewhat higher at 4.44 (mean). However, the highest rated item was number 4 which asked students to rate the presenter's knowledge of the topic; the response to this item was 4.54 (mean). As with other survey instruments used by the Learning Center in 1991-92, student responses to this survey were significantly above the 2.5 survey mean.

Moreover, it should be noted that even when students gave ratings of 3 and 4 to the survey items, they frequently commented (by written response on the survey) that the presentation was helpful. The lowest rated item (item 1) concerning whether material met students' expectations may be attributed partially to the fact that some of the topics were new (self-management, for example), and students may have been somewhat uncertain as to what the topics would cover; furthermore, students were required to attend a number of seminars by the Counseling staff in order to meet requirements of freshman orientation, and, thus, some students attended seminars merely to receive credit, not because they were interested in the topic being presented. The published schedule of Success Seminars for the 1992-93 academic year will

stress that students are invited to attend all seminars; however, students are encouraged to attend only those in which they are genuinely interested.

A Review of Goals

1990-91 Goals: Progress Report

The 1990-91 Annual Report from the SPC Learning Center, "Making a Difference," contained a list of goals for the 1991-92 academic year. Those goals were (a) to establish a computerized learning center (with CCC and CEI software) in order to meet the needs of academically disadvantaged students and students with special needs; (b) to provide an in-service program to increase reading awareness among faculty; (c) to invite department chairs and faculty representatives to lunch to discuss connections between the Learning Center and the departments; (d) to offer assistance in evaluating writing samples from the PTT to provide accurate placement in writing courses; (e) to use the alternate form of the PTT as an exit test for RDG 030 and 034 and as a preliminary indicator for RDG 036 and 026; (f) to convert the independent study lab into a TASP Preparation Lab; and (g) to sponsor professional development workshops for Learning Center faculty on the topics of meeting the needs of handicapped students, advisement, meeting the needs of learning disabled students, and SAC Resources.

Four of these 7 goals were accomplished, at least in part. The computerized Lab with CCC software was established; however, the ten station system was inadequate to meet all the needs of academically disadvantaged students. Also interfering with the peak effectiveness of the Lab was the fact that for much of the academic year only a part-time lab instructor was approved to work in the Lab. For optimal efficiency and real effectiveness, a

full-time lab instructor is required. Moreover, the CEI software for use with the Apple computers by students with handicapping conditions (limited intelligence, for example) was not obtained and was not requested in the 1992-93 budget as the Coordinator of Special Services made substantial requests for equipment which would enable students with other handicapping conditions to attend college (computer hardware and software for the visually impaired, copiers, etc.). The Learning Center has, however, requested in its 1992-93 budget allocations for the expansion of the CCC into a 20 station system.

The Learning Center staff did offer support in grading writing samples, and individual faculty working in the Learning Center did, on several occasions, interact with members of the English Dept. regarding issues of mutual concern (instruction incorporating computers for writing, standards for remedial writing courses, etc.). Faculty did use the alternate form of the PTT as an exit measure for RDG 030 and 034 and as an indicator for RDG 035 and 026. Professional development workshops on meeting the needs of handicapped and learning disabled students were provided for Learning Center faculty; however, the advisement workshop has not yet been scheduled.

Efforts were made to provide a session on critical thinking skills; however, those attempts were unsuccessful. Nonetheless, the Learning Center did acquire in 1991-92 a series of critical thinking videotapes based on the materials the prospective presenter had recommended. Efforts were made to acquire support materials in the Lab to enable students to prepare for TASP; however, the goal of converting the Lab into a TASP Lab was reconsidered. A TASP Lab would be much more limited than what the current Lab offers and might mislead those who are seeking services to improve their general academic

skills, prepare for entering the nursing program, or to acquire study skills, among other needs. And, although there was not a workshop on SAC resources, program directors and counselors did begin monthly meetings with the Dean of Students and his staff, and this became an ideal forum for sharing information about resources.

The Learning Center faculty did not offer a reading awareness program for faculty, and the restructuring of the school calendar and the limited time available for inservice training make such a program unlikely in the 1992-93 academic year. However, the Learning Center faculty did offer a program for nontraditional learners (and for faculty wanting to help nontraditional learners) as a service during Community College Week.

Although the Learning Center did not continue to invite department chairs and faculty to lunch, Learning Center faculty did make efforts to interact with faculty in other departments (e.g., Ms. Shamburger worked with Ms. Cottenoir, Chair of Nursing, on the reading course for nurses; Ms. Solomon worked with Dr. Felker, English Chair, in the English Dept. Writing Lab; and, Ms. Turrentine worked with Ms. Ellis, Communications Chair, in the Communications Dept. and Mr. Tubb, Mr. Mayberry, Mr. Morris, and Mr. Beasley in the Athletic Dept.). Since there are no funds budgeted for luncheon meetings, it is unlikely that the Learning Center will be able to accomplish this goal under current budget constraints.

Goals for 1992-93

In light of the progress or lack of progress of the Learning Center in meeting its goals for 1991-92, there is some hesitation to formulate extensive and specific goals for 1992-93. However, the Learning Center does offer the following goals for the up-coming academic year:

--Expand the CCC services provided in the Learning Center Lab (including the support services of a full-time Lab Instructor);

--Respond promptly to the needs and concerns of faculty as revealed by the survey administered in spring 1992 (including increased publicity, information dissemination, preparation and production of brochures, fliers, etc., personal contacts, etc.);

--Continue efforts to forge relationships with departments on campus to form partnerships in learning;

--Continue efforts to gather, analyze, and report data documenting program effectiveness in support of remedial instruction and academic support services;

--Expand the number and topics of Success Seminars to meet more effectively the diverse needs of the student population;

--Continue efforts to establish a warmer and friendlier climate on campus for all individuals regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, and learning differences.

Conclusions

In the 1990-91 Annual Report, changes in the Learning Center since the last published Annual Report (1987-88) were described. These included the implementation of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP), the realignment of remedial English and math within academic boundaries, and a change in the Learning Center's reporting mechanism. No such sweeping changes pertain to this Annual Report for the 1991-92 academic year.

The TASP is a fact of life, although there are still difficulties associated with TASP. One is the need, fueled by state funding, to provide noncourse-based remediation. This has resulted in the formation of departmental policies governing noncourse-based remediation and an institutional policy statement. [See Appendix B.] Another difficulty is the inadequacy of the institutional database to identify and properly track

individuals who are TASP-required. Departments, unless they are agressive in gathering data to evaluate program effectiveness, are somewhat insulated from this concern: on the other hand, the Learning Center, with its active stance, often collides with an inaccurate and incomplete file of student records and a lack of statistical tools (SPSS, SAS, etc). An additional concern, but one over which the SPC Learning Center has no control, is the apparent ever-declining standards for the TASP test. It was and remains inadequate as a tool to assess that students possess even minimal skills for undertaking collegiate study. A final difficulty, also noted in the 1990-91 Annual Report, is the negative attitudes, often conveyed as personal animosity, of some administrators and faculty towards the TASP, the test and the program of remediation and accountability. Furthermore, this negativity is aggravated by increasing state and federal demands for fiscal and instructional accountability, viewed as unnecessary and unwanted intrusions by outsiders into the institution's business.

Looking at TASP from a broader perspective, recent data on the performance of SPC students shows their skills to be significantly poorer than those of students across the state. The 1991 year-end statewide test results show that of a total of 104,266 students taking the TASP, 87 percent passed the reading test; of 576 SPC students taking the TASP in 1992, only 78 percent passed the reading test. Eighty-five percent of 109,141 Texas students passed the math test, but only 62 percent of 373 SPC students passed math. And, of the 109,313 students statewide who took the writing test, 81 percent passed; of the 436 SPC students taking the test in 1992, only 74 percent passed.

What's Ahead

Just as the 1990-91 Annual Report concluded with commentary on some of the issues facing the Learning Center in the future, so this 1991-92 report ends. What does the future hold?

It appears that the need for remediation, especially at community colleges, will be even greater in the future. Mercer (1992) predicts that because of state budget woes, there will be an ever-increasing tendency to funnel students into community colleges for the first two years of undergraduate education; this, of course, is necessitated by the higher cost of a university education versus a community college education and translates into higher tuitions and fees at universities, which are also frequently accompanied by rising academic admissions requirements. This, then, has the effect of increasing the responsibility of community colleges to educate those with less financial means to attend college and, by and large, those with less academic preparation for undertaking college study. These students require extensive academic support services as well as remediation of specific academic skills deficiencies.

The overwhelming number of students currently requiring remediation, estimated between one-third and one-half of all students entering higher education (Doyle & Kearns, 1991; Skinner & Carter, 1987), is only exacerbated by the fact that it is becoming easier to attain high school graduation, at least in Texas. This unfortunately is the case even though high school performance traditionally has been a poor indicator of readiness to undertake college work; for example, Samuelson (1991) found that 81 percent of college freshmen had a B average or better in high school math, but only 5 percent were ready for college math. An Educational Testing Service (ETS) report

indicated that the public school reforms of the last decade have resulted in no real progress in student achievement. Now a Texas high school diploma means even less.

To explain this claim, in Texas, students are required to pass the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills test (TAAS) in order to receive a high school diploma. Curtis (1992), in the popular press, recently called the TAAS "elementary" and compared it to the SAT, noting, "The SAT is so much harder that the TAAS isn't even remotely on the same level. In fact, it is so easy it doesn't measure up against the test to become a Border Patrol agent" (p. 10). He also compared the TAAS with the test to enter the armed forces and found the TAAS lacking; indeed, he concluded:

> The TAAS can test only the curriculum the students have been asked to master. If the entrance requirements for some of our most basic jobs--private in the Army, for example--are stiffer than the requirements in our schools, then our schools are not demanding enough. And they, as well as the TAAS test, are a cruel delusion. (p.12)

Moreover, the delusion is further perpetrated by the recent decision of the State Board of Education to lower the passing standard for the TAAS from 70 to 60 percent.

To make matters even more shameful, if that's possible, a mother of a high school senior recently wrote to the editor of a local newspaper that her son, although excellent in extracurricular activities, was not going to be allowed to graduate with his peers because he had not passed the TAAS test and--what's worse--that meant that he wouldn't be able to accept the two college scholarships he had been offered. As additional anecdotal support, an instructor called this semester to ask about a scholarship candidate who had

not passed the TAAS to find out how "far his score was off." Some investigation revealed that the student needed to answer 8 more items correctly on a 35-item test in order to pass the relevant section of the TAAS (pretty "far off"). Perhaps it's time to question what the term "scholarship" means.

As undeniable the role is for community colleges to remediate, there is still amazing denial. When a third of all English courses and one-half of all math courses taught are remedial, then remediation must be more than an afterthought. That some community college faculty still believe that real English professors teach literature and criticism and that real math professors teach nothing below calculus is just one manifestation of the obstacles faced by professionals teaching in developmental programs (as is the conclusion that anyone with any kind of degree or experience can teach remedial courses). More importantly, these insidious attitudes represent just a few of the hurdles that must be jumped by students in need of remediation.

The fact that resources are seldom equitably distributed to and within programs and departments meeting the demands of the large proportion of students who are academically underprepared is another manifestation. Thus, resource allocation remains a crucial issue, just as it is for all of public and higher education. State funding for the fiscal year 1991 for remediation at South Plains College was $106,352 (separate from contact-hour funding for courses and federal monies to provide services to special populations students); however, there is no apparent connection between state allocations for remediation and institutional budgets for programs providing remediation.

The biggest challenge to academic support services and remediation is the same as the one faced by all of higher education, although it is not generally

experienced proportionately by all segments within higher education. This coming year, we are asked to tighten our belts, but there's an argument that the buckle is already in the last notch. When it's time to trim the fat, programs providing remediation and academic support services would have been among the first put on the diet if it were not for the fact that they've always, from the start, been uncommonly lean.

There's no excess to trim, no extras, no luxuries, just bottom-line necessities to provide an ever-increasing and ever more important service--without which, attaining a college education, for many, will remain just a dream. What the future holds simply depends on whether or not the Learning Center receives the resources and administrative support it requires and deserves. The data presented in this report document both the demand for and the essentiality of these services and programs, along with the value of the activities in terms of student outcomes and achievement.

The Learning Center's challenge to other entities within the institution remains. All departments, programs, and activities should produce data to demonstrate and justify their effectiveness and efficiency. External demands for accountability must become internalized as routine matters of course.

References

Abraham, A. A. (1992). College remedial studies: Institutional practices in the SREB states. Atlanta: Southern Region Education Board.

Abraham, A. A. (1991). They came to college? A remedial/developmental profile of first-time college freshmen in SREB states. Issues in Higher Education, No. 25. Southern Region Education Board.

Curtis, G. (1992, April). Testing delusions. Texas Monthly (pp. 5, 10, 12).

Doyle, D. P., & Kearns, D. T. (1991). Winning the brain race: A bold plan to make our schools competitive. New York: ICS Press.

Education Testing Service. (1990). After ten years of educational reform, are our kids getting a better education? ETS Developments, Summer (36, 1), p. 4-6.

Letter to the Editor. (1992, May 17). Avalanche-Journal. Lubbock, Texas.

Mercer, J. (1992). States turn to community colleges as route to bachelor's degree as 4-year campuses face tight budgets and overcrowding. Chronicle of Higher Education, 1, A28.

Platt, G. M. (1991). Making a difference: The 1990-91 learning center annual report (South Plains College, Levelland, Texas). ERIC Document No. 333 937.

Samuelson, R. J. (1991, May 27). Why school reform fails. Newsweek (pp. 62, 66).

Skinner, E. F., & Carter, S. (1987). A second chance for Texans: Remedial education in the two-year colleges. Tempe, AZ: National Center for Post-Secondary Governance at Arizona State University.

APPENDIX A

Remedial Reading Coursework
(Semester Data by Specific Courses)

The first level of remedial reading instruction available at South Plains College is RDG 030, a course for students who have had a history of academic difficulties due to reading problems. Generally speaking, the students enrolled in this course enter college reading below the sixth grade level. In the fall 1991, 16 students were enrolled and 69 percent passed the course. (This means that they were eligible to enroll in the next level of reading remediation, RDG 034, not that they had completed remediation.) Three students of the 16 took the official TASP. One student who made an F in the course did pass the writing part of the test, but failed the reading part. Another student who made an A in the course and one who made a C attempted the TASP, but both students failed both the reading and writing parts of the test. Hence, the TASP success rate for RDG 030 in the fall 1991 was 0 percent for reading and 33 percent for writing.

In the spring 1992, 12 students enrolled in RDG 030. Two of these students attempted the TASP in February, but both students failed the reading test. Again, the Learning Center faculty recommend that students enrolled in beginning remediation not attempt the official TASP until they have completed at least two semesters of reading remediation.

The second level of reading remediation is RDG 034, a course for students who read below the ninth grade level. Sixty-six percent of the 101 students enrolled in the fall 1991 passed the course. Likewise, 67 percent of the 39 students enrolled in the spring 1992 passed the course. For the fall semester, there was a 50 percent success rate on TASP for reading and a 67 percent success rate for writing. Only 6 (less than 6%) students who had completed RDG 034 took the official TASP test; of those 6 students, three had made A's in the course, 2 had made B's, and one had made a D. Of the three making A's, one passed the reading part of TASP and two passed the writing part of TASP. Of the two making B's, one passed the reading and writing part of TASP and one passed the reading part. The one student making a D passed the writing part of TASP, but failed the reading part. The TASP success rate for RDG 034 in the spring 1992 was 88 percent; 7 of the 8 students who attempted the TASP test passed the reading part with scores ranging from 222 to 277 (with 220 required for passing the test and 300 being a perfect score).

Three courses are offered as exit-level remediation in reading. One of these is a two-hour course for vocabulary development, RDG 026. In the fall 1991, 15 students enrolled in RDG 026 and 67 percent passed the course. The TASP success rate was 100% in reading and 50% in writing. One student who attempted the TASP made an A in the course and passed both the reading and writing sections of the TASP. The only other student attempting TASP made a D in the course and passed the reading part of the TASP but failed the writing part. Similarly, in the spring 1992, 28 students enrolled in RDG 026 and 67 percent passed the course. Forty-three percent of the students passed the TASP reading test in February. Three students took and passed the reading test with scores ranging from 251 to 298; four attempted the TASP, but failed the reading test with scores ranging from 132 to 209.

Of the 79 students enrolled in another exit-level course (RDG 035) in the fall 1991, 63 percent passed the course, and 75 percent passed the TASP reading test and 100 percent passed the TASP writing test. Significantly, of the students enrolled in exit-level reading remediation (RDG 035) in the fall 1991, only 4 students (5 percent) took the TASP after completing the course. Only one student who made an A in the course took the TASP and passed both the reading and writing parts, as did one student who made a B in the course and one student who made a PR in the course. One student who made a C in the course passed the writing part of the test, but failed the reading part. Likewise, of the 65 students enrolled in RDG 035 in the spring 1992, 80 percent passed the course and 75 percent passed the TASP reading test. Twelve of these students took and passed the TASP reading test with scores ranging from 222 to 277: four attempted the TASP in February but failed with scores ranging from 125 to 208. One student had already passed the reading test and took and passed the TASP writing test in February (score 220).

The third exit-level remedial course (ENG 038) combines reading and writing instruction. In the fall 1991, 32 students enrolled and 62 percent passed. The TASP success rate for this course was 100% for reading and writing; after enrolling in ENG 038, eighteen students attempted the TASP and passed both the reading and writing tests. One student who had failed the course also attempted the TASP, but failed both the reading and writing sections. In the spring 1992, 57 students enrolled in ENG 038 and 72 percent passed the course. Two of the students took and passed the TASP reading and writing tests in February 1992; two attempted only the reading test and passed it; two attempted only the writing test and passed it. Five students attempted both the reading and writing tests and failed both; three attempted only the writing test and failed. Thus, the course had a 43 percent success rate for the TASP reading test.

Finally, the Learning Center offers one college-level reading course, RDG 133. Occasionally, students who have narrowly missed passing the TASP reading test enroll in RDG 133 and participate in a required lab option to satisfy the requirements of continuous remediation. In the fall 1991, 8 students enrolled in RDG 133 and all passed (100%) the course. For this group, the TASP success rate was 100 percent for reading and 86 percent for writing. Seven students took the TASP after being in RDG 133 and all 7 passed the reading test and 6 passed the writing test. As of February 1992, the other student who passed the course had not taken the TASP. Ten students enrolled in RDG 133 in the spring 1992 and 70 percent passed the course. Three of these students took the TASP test and all three passed the reading section with scores ranging from 244 to 258 in February 1992; two of these students also passed the writing part with scores of 240.

Addendum

TASP score report information from the April 1992 testing date revealed that an additional 18 reading students attempted the TASP reading test. Therefore, of all students enrolled in exit-level reading remediation in the spring 1992, less than half (45 percent) attempted the TASP reading test during the spring semester. The overall pass rate for those attempting the test was 72 percent (33 students out of 46). This lowered passing rate can be

attributed, in part, to the inappropriate placement of students in exit-level reading courses. For example, students who score between 125 and 150 on the TASP reading test are ineligible to enroll in exit-level reading courses. Furthermore, students are not recommended to take the RDG 026 course unless they have a marginal score on the official TASP test; the lowered passing rate for the RDG 026 program is associated with the placement of students who had PTT scores only at the time they were placed into the course.

Specifically, the spring 1992 pass rate for RDG 035 was 75 percent (21 students out of 28); for RDG 026, it was 54 percent (7 students out of 13), and for RDG 133, it was 100 percent (5 students).

Ten students enrolled in ENG 038 in the spring semester took the TASP test in April. Combining their results with those taking the test in February revealed that 13 attempted the reading test and 7 passed (54 percent) whereas 14 attempted the writing test and 6 passed (43 percent). These lowered passing percentages can be attributed to (a) the placement of students in ENG 038 who did not meet the placement criteria for the course, and (b) the fact that many of the students who took and failed the TASP test did so in February when they had completed less than 6 weeks of remedial instruction in reading and writing (The latter was true for 7 of the students.).

APPENDIX B

Procedures for Non-Course Based Remediation

I. Identification of students for non-course based remediation.
   A. Student identified by instructor, Counseling Center or Learning Center.
   B. Recommendation is sent to appropriate department chair for approval.
   C. Departmental chair notifies the registrar of need for course.

II. Creation of course in computer.
   A. The registrar will create the appropriate course in the computer.
   B. The course will have a unique section number based on the instructor of the course.
      1. Each course will be unique for the instructor regardless of the number of students involved or length of remediation required.
      2. For courses using peer tutors, the Director of the Learning Center or the instructor charged with supervision of the tutors will be listed as the instructor.
   C. For each course created, a class roll and gradebook will be generated and sent to the instructor.

III. Record-keeping for non-course based instruction.
   A. Instructors should keep accurate attendance and progress records in the gradebook that is provided.
   B. Instructors should provide a contract for each student which indicates what is required in the course.
      1. Contract should be signed by the student.
      2. Instructor should keep a copy, give the student a copy, and send a copy to the registrar's office for the student's file.
   C. At the conclusion of the semester, the instructor will receive a Final Grade Roll for each course.
      1. These grade rolls should be completed and returned as per final grade instructions.
      2. Grading procedures for the courses will be determined by the individual departments.

*IV. Non-participation in required remediation.
   A. Students in non-course based remediation are subject to the same state requirements for continuous remediation as any other student.
   B. Students that fail to participate in non-course based remediation should be reported to Dean Long's office--just like students in course based remediation.
   C. If necessary, Dean Long will send the student's names to the Registrar, and the students will be withdrawn from school.

[NOTE: These procedures were developed by Mr. Bobby James, Dean of Admissions, South Plains College, Levelland, and are for the Levelland campus only.]

Appendix B (continued)

Non-course Based Instruction:
Proposed Compensation

I. Individual Study

A. Full Semester (minimum of 15 assignments*) includes grading assignments and testing.

(1) $90 per student (maximum: 10 students)

B. Part Semester (1-14 assignments) includes grading assignments and testing.

(1) $6 per assignment or test (maximum: 150 assignments/tests--based on number of students times their assignments)

II. Computer and Video-Tape Study

A. Full Semester (minimum of 15 assignments*) includes grading assignments and testing.

(1) Specialized assignments $60 per student (maximum: 15 students)
(2) Packaged assignments $45 per student (maximum: 20 students)

B. Part Semester (1-14 assignments)

(1) Specialized assignments $4 per assignment (maximum: 225 assignments/tests--based on number of students times their assignments)
(2) Packaged assignments $3 per assignment (maximum: 300 assignments/tests--based on number of students times their assignments)

*The faculty member together with the chairperson/director will determine what constitutes an assignment.

[NOTE: This proposal came from the Vice-President of Academic Affairs Office, South Plains College, Levelland.]

APPENDIX C

READING 000: Reading Improvement Plan of Action (Contract)

Name:_____SS#_____Sem._____Yr._____

Address:_____Phone:_____
zip

Step 1: Obtain approval for enrollment in Reading 000:
Come to the Learning Center to see the Director and/or one of the reading faculty.

Because my reading score on the TASP test is below-passing yet within 3 points of passing,* I choose to fulfill the legal requirements of TASP by enrolling in RDG 000, a noncredit, independent-study program supervised by the SPC Learning Center to improve my reading skills. I will continue to enroll in a developmental course at the college until the college receives official notification that I have passed all parts of the TASP test.

*Note any exceptions to this criterion below:

_____

_____

I understand and acknowledge that

1. the Learning Center will evaluate continuously whether or not I am fulfilling this requirement;
2. if I fulfill this requirement a grade of PR (progress) will be given, but this grade does not guarantee that I will pass the TASP Reading Test; and
3. if I fail to fulfill course requirements, I WILL BE FORCIBLY WITHDRAWN FROM THIS COURSE AND POSSIBLY ALL COURSES at the college.

Information Release Authorization: I hereby authorize the Learning Center to release to or discuss with other entities of SPC information about my work related to TASP skills development that I undertake in the Learning Center.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE COURSE DESCRIPTION, THE INFORMATION, AND POLICIES CONTAINED IN THIS AGREEMENT, including this contract, the course guide, and evaluation form.

Student Signature:_____Date:_____

Learning Center Director/
Faculty Signature:_____Date:_____

Lab Instructor Signature
(if needed):_____Date:_____

Step 2: Go to the Registrar's Office to enroll in RDG 000.

Step 3: Begin the course: Bring this agreement with attachments AND your TASP Score Report for discussion with your instructor on

_____(day/time) in _____(location).

Step 4: Participate in the course: I will work on my reading skills in the Learning Center for _____ (amount of time) each week beginning on _____ (date) and continuing through _____ (date) for a total of _____ hours or until I otherwise successfully complete the course. I agree to come to lab at the following times:

_____(days, hours)

If I must miss a session, I agree to call (806) 894-9611, ext. 241 or ext. _____ (ahead of time or within 24 hours of missing) to notify my instructor of my absence and to arrange within one week to make-up the time I have missed.

I understand that there are no excused absences. I must make-up within one week each absence I have. I understand that if at any time during the semester I fail to comply with the attendance requirements, I risk being forcibly withdrawn from the college for the semester.

Student Signature:_____Date:_____

Instructor Signature:_____Date:_____

Step 5: Complete the course: Request a copy of this signed and completed agreement and turn in your course evaluation.

Outcome: ___Satisfactory (PR) ___Unsatisfactory (F) _____Withdrawn

Based on: ___Participation ___Progress ___TASP Reading Test Score (score: _____)

Evaluation completed and turned in: _____yes _____no

Instructor Signature:_____Date:_____

NOTE TO INSTRUCTOR: Keep one copy of this agreement for your files, one copy for the Learning Center's files, and one copy for the Registrar's Office.

Reading 000
Your Course Guide

Introduction

The main goal of this course is to help you pass the reading section of the TASP test, but the course goes beyond this rudimentary objective. It also aims to help you develop the kind of reading skills you'll need to be successful in college.

You were identified to participate in this course on the basis of your official TASP scores in reading; therefore, your score report is important. Your TASP score report provides information about six reading skills: (1) the meaning of words and phrases, (2) main ideas, (3) writer's purpose, (4) relationships, (5) critical reasoning, and (6) study skills. Information about your performance in these six areas will help you and your instructor select the exercises you need to work on to improve your skills and to pass the TASP reading test.

Because Reading 000 is an individualized-study course, you must take the initiative of gaining approval for enrolling in the course, registering for the course, participating in activities, maintaining contact with your instructor, and completing the requirements of the course. These are your responsibility.

A reading teacher will work with you and monitor your progress through this course. After an initial meeting with the teacher--at which time your TASP scores will be discussed, you and the reading teacher will select exercises and activities. You will then sign a Reading Improvement Plan of Action contract in order to demonstrate that you have complied with the state-mandated requirements of TASP.

The Learning Center faculty hope that you will enjoy your work and find what you learn useful. We are interested in hearing your comments about the activities you are working on, and we hope you will let us know how things are going.

Your Plan

Your Reading Improvement Plan of Action will be based on your TASP scores. You will need to bring your score report with you at the time of your initial meeting with the faculty.

The resources you will be using can be found in the Reading Lab. Each time you visit the Reading Lab you will need to check in with the Lab Instructor or attendant. He or she will supervise your work in the Lab and record your participation.

If you have questions as you work on activities or assignments, ask if you want help! We are eager to discuss your work with you (although sometimes the lab does get busy!).

Keep up with your work! In order for you to get the most out of Reading 000, you are going to have to put in some hard work and some time. But, the skills you acquire should be useful in college and in your life's work, so your investment will pay off in lucrative dividends.

TASP Skills and Resources

Vocabulary

One skill measured on the TASP reading test is the meaning of words and phrases or vocabulary in context. In order to build these skills, you may wish to work on the following or to follow another suggestion made by a reading teacher:

Single Skills (Vocabulary in Context, a workbook)
Critical Reading Skills (CRS, VO module, on the CCC computer system)
The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 4, a workbook)
Other:

_____

_____

_____

Comprehension

The word comprehension literally means "to grasp." When you understand something well enough to take action based on what you have read, then you have comprehended the material. Reading comprehension includes a number of skills including four TASP reading skills.

Main Ideas

If you need to work on main ideas, you may select from the following or other suggestions made by a reading teacher:

The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 5)
Single Skills (Main Ideas, Supporting Details)
GEDP--Interpreting Literature and the Arts (LA lessons 2-10, on the CCC computer)
Other:

_____

_____

_____

Writer's Purpose, Point of View, and Intended Meaning

The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 6)
GEDP--Interpreting Literature and the Arts (LA lessons 2-13, CCC computer system)
Critical Reading Skills (RC module, CCC computer system)
Other:

_____

_____

_____

Relationships Among Ideas

The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 7)
Critical Reading Skills (RC module, CCC computer system)
Other:

_____

_____

_____

Critical Reasoning to Evaluate Ideas

The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 8)
Critical Reading Skills (RC module, CCC computer system)
Other:

_____

_____

_____

Study Skills

Study Skills, assessed by TASP, are primarily the skills of organization, logic, and summation. The following may be helpful to you:

The Official TASP Study Guide (chapter 9)
Study Skills: How to Read a Textbook (video 5-08)
How to Survive in School: Notetaking and Outlining Skills (video 5-06)
Effective Study Strategies (video 5-13)

Other:

_____

_____

_____.

FILE: LEARNING CENTER
DISK: STATISTICS
ITEM: 2-YEAR TRACK--NUMBERS

TERM:		90-91		91-92 (42%)	
RECORDS:		1502	(%)	2138	(%)
SEX	MALE:	788	(52)	1085	(51)
	FEMALE:	714	(48)	1053	(49)
ETHNICITY	CAUCASIAN (1):	1048	(70)	1454	(68)
	BLACK (2):	109	(7)	151	(7)
	HISPANIC (3):	323	(22)	495	(23)
	ORIENTAL (4):	3	(*)	6	(*)
	AMERICAN INDIAN (5):	5	(*)	8	(*)
	FOREIGN (6):	14	(1)	24	(1)
	OTHER (7):	--	/	--	/
AGE	16:	1	(*)	1	(*)
	17:	15	(1)	13	(*)
	18:	449	(30)	486	(23)
	19:	420	(28)	521	(24)
	20-25:	368	(25)	598	(28)
	25-->:	243	(16)	466	(22)
	UNKNOWN:	6	(*)	53	(2)
TASP STATUS	PASSED ALL (1):	466		706	
	FAILED 1 OR MORE (2):	306		352	
	PRETASP/PASSED ALL (3):	104		38	
	PRETASP/FAILED 1-3 (4):	194		229	
	WAIVER/CERTIFICATE (5):	25		73	
	WAIVER/TRANS.PEND. (6):	5		5	
	TASP-VERIFIED Y/N (7):	3		--	
	NO TEST.DOCUMENT. (8):	55		247	
	EXEMPT/3 HRS.<F'89 (9):	344		497	
TASP SCORES		(782)		(1092)	
	READING :	(781)		(1087)	
	-->219:	132		166	
	220-->:	649	(83)	921	(85)
	WRITING:	(774)		(1068)	
	-->219:	188		189	
	220-->:	586	(76)	879	(82)
	MATH:	(782)		(1077)	
	-->219:	207		260	
	220-->:	575	(74)	817	(76)
PRE-TASP SCORES		(358)		(351)	
	READING:	(356)		(346)	
	-->69:	192		192	
	70-->:	164	(46)	154	(45)
	WRITING:	(356)		(346)	
	-->69:	202		192	
	70-->:	154	(43)	154	(45)
	MATH:	(358)		(351)	
	-->69:	242		255	
	70-->:	116	(32)	96	(27)

		TERM:	90-91		91-92	
		RECORDS:	1502	(%)	2138	(%)
GRADE POINT AVG.		*CUMULATIVE:	(1345)	(90%)	(1941)	(91%)
		4.0:	39	(3)	47	(2)
		3.0-3.99:	390	(26)	573	(27)
	(75%)	2.0-2.99:	582	(39)	(79%) 915	(43)
		1.0-1.99:	247	(16)	316	(15)
		-->0.99:	86	(6)	90	(4)
		W:	82	(5)	76	(3)
		NT:	15	(1)	15	(*)
		N-S:	61	(4)	106	(5)
		*MEAN:	(2.52)		(2.58)	(2%)
		COLLEGE LEVEL ONLY:	(590)		(735)	
		4.0:	21	(4)	24	(3)
		3.0-3.99:	227	(38)	279	(38)
	(82%)	2.0-2.99:	233	(40)	(83%) 305	(42)
		1.0-1.99:	78	(13)	95	(13)
		-->0.99:	31	(5)	32	(4)
		MEAN:	(2.70)		(2.71)	(*%)
		ALTERNATE:	(770)		(1109)	
		4.0:	89	(12)	172	(14)
		3.0-3.99:	196	(25)	323	(26)
	+(71%)	2.0-2.99:	197	(26)	+(82%) 299	(24)
		1.0-1.99:	115	(15)	171	(14)
		-->0.99:	107	(14)	144	(12)
		PR:	65	(8)	112	(9)
		MEAN:	(2.29)		(2.61)	(14%)
MAJOR		T-V-O:	756	(50)	1100	(51)
		ACADEMIC:	535	(36)	700	(33)
		UNDECIDED:	211	(14)	276	(13)
		OUTREACH:	N/A	/	62	(3)
EQUITY ANALYSIS			(52)	(3%)	(89)	(4%)
		MALE:	34	(65)	53	(60)
		FEMALE:	18	(35)	36	(40)

*Mean based on completers (# in parenthesis at top of each column); however, percentages in these categories are based on whole group placement. [EX: cumulative GPA mean does not include W/NT/N-S; therefore completer #'s 1345 and 1941 are used to compute mean.]

*Percentages are tracked for success rate, therefore whole group #'s (records: top of page) are used.

For purposes of this evaluation, only those GPA's at 2.0 or higher are considered successful. [PR (Progress) grades are based on students who are progressing at a "C" level in classes, therefore PR's are included in the success rate percent for students enrolled in alternate classes.]

LEARNING CENTER
2-YEAR TRACK--CONTACTS

TERM:	90-91		91-92		
	#	VISITS	#	VISITS	(%)
DISTRIBUTION AREA					
ORIENTATION/VIDEO SEM:	1223	1223	1331	1331	
CCC/INDEPENDENT LAB:	133	859	107	163	<81%>*
INQUIRIES:	20	20	30	30	
COLLEGE SUCCESS COURSE:	45	17+	55	27+	
DEVELOP.COMMUNICATIONS:	7	23+	12	124+	
READING:	255	523+	393	1730+	
ENGLISH:	102	85+	144	143+	
TUTORING:	539	2500	906	4899	
SEMINARS:	1529	1529	1059	1059	<31%>*
ND PREP/NURS.PROGRAM:	56	247	27	261	
COUNSELING (LC OFFICE):	16	16	61	61	
TOTAL VISITS:		7042+		9828+	(40%)

*Students listed in the CCC/Independent Lab category were in addition to any Learning Center class enrollment who participated in lab. Decrease was due to changover to CCC/IBM format in the Fall 1991 which led to shutdown of the Lab for an extended period of time, however; overall use of the Lab was increased by Learning Center class enrollment.

Seminar participation was decreased due in part to limited space availability and the development of optional programs for the fulfillment of Orientation requirements.

+ Numbers listed for Learning Center class enrollment are visits to the Lab or Learning Center office IN ADDITION to regular class participation. Class attendance is indicated by "+" at the end of the number.

Individual student names and areas where service was provided are available in the Learning Center's Statistics Books for 1990-91 and 1991-92 under the semester in which the service occurred.

LEARNING CENTER
EQUITY ANALYSIS
1991-1992

FEMALE IN NON-TRADITIONAL MAJOR	#
Agri-Business	1
Electronics Service Technology	2
Auto Technology	--
Law Enforcement	28
Petroleum Technology	--
Drafting Technology	5
SUBTOTAL	36
MALE IN NON-TRADITIONAL MAJOR	
Child Development (Child Care Option)	--
Fashion Merchandising	1
Medical Secretary	--
Medical Records Technology	--
Legal Assistant	--
Word Processing Specialist	2
Vocational Nursing	2
Associate Degree Nursing	48
SUBTOTAL	53
GRAND TOTAL	89

ETHNICITY		AGE	
Caucasian (1):	54	16:	--
Black (2):	07	17:	--
Hispanic (3):	27	18:	13
Oriental (4):	--	19:	11
American Indian (5):	01	20-25:	26
Foreign (6):	--	25-->:	39
Other (7):	--	Unknown:	--

FILE: LEARNING CENTER

DISK: STATISTICS

RECORDS 2138

TERM: SUM II'91-SPR'92

SEX: M 1085 F 1053

DOB:
16 1
17 13
18 486
19 521
20-25 598
25 → 466
Unknown: 53

ETHNICITY:
Caucasian (1): 1454
Black (2): 151
Hispanic (3): 495
Oriental (4): 6
American Indian (5): 8
Foreign (6): 24
Other (7): —

TASP STATUS:
706 (1) TASP—Passed all Sections
352 (2) TASP—Failed at least one Section
38 (3) PRETASP—Passed all Sections
229 (4) PRETASP—Failed at least one Section
* 73 (5) WAIVER—Certificate Program *15-took TASP/ 14 took PTT
5 (6) WAIVER—Not tested/Transcript Pending
-- (7) TASP—Transfer/Verified Y-N
247 (8) NO TESTING DOCUMENTATION
* 488 (9) EXEMPT—College Credit Hours prior Fall 1989
*19 took TASP/ 70 took PTT

	TASP SCORES: (1092)	PRE-TASP SCORES: (351)
Reading:	(1087)	(346)
→ 219:	166	→ 69: 192
220 → :	921	70 → : 154
Writing:	(1068)	(346)
→ 219:	189	→ 69: 192
220 → :	879	70 → : 154
Math:	(1077)	(351)
→ 219:	260	→ 69: 255
220 → :	817	70 → : 96

CUMULATIVE GPA: (1941) (735) (1109)

		COL	ALT
4.0	47	(24)	(172)
3.0-3.99	573	(279)	(323)
2.0-2.99	915	(305)	(299)
1.0-1.99	316	(95)	(171)
→0.99	90	(32)	(144)
W	(76)		PR(112)
NT	(15)		
N-S	(106)		
GPA: MEAN	(2.58)	(2.71)	(2.61)

TVO: 1100

ACAD: 700

UNDECIDED: 276

OUTREACH: 62

EQUITY ANALYSIS: (89)
M 53
F 36

AREA OF DISTRIBUTION:

ORI/VSO: 1331
CCC/IND: 107
INQ: 30
CSC: 55
D C: 12
RDG: 393
ENG: 144
TUT: 906
SEM: 1059
NDPREP/IND: 27
COU: 61

ATTACHMENT 3

Faculty Evaluation of the Learning Center (Verbatim Remarks)

In spring 1992, a survey was mailed to 150 faculty. Thirty-three surveys were completed and returned. Below are the verbatim remarks to the first survey item (a sentence completion, "The Learning Center is . . .")

The Learning Center is

essential for most of our students to achieve their goals in life.
doing a good job of providing services to students. I am glad that one location can solve so many problems for students.
necessary for the students of SPC.
a valuable resource for students at SPC. Faculty and staff in this area are concerned professionals.
a valuable tool.
helpful to developmental students.
an asset, however, response to student needs has been inconsistent this past year.
doing a good job helping students of all backgrounds and skills.
a wonderful place for students to go to improve their reading or study skills.
absolutely great!!! You have really helped to make it easier for us when dealing with the "poorer" student or those under great stress.
very beneficial. I wonder if it needs more exposure.
a source for troubled students. It provides free tutoring (when possible) and teaches better study habits.
a place students can go for help and encouragement.
effective in providing instruction in reading skills and providing tutorial support for traditional students and very effective in providing college success skills courses and information.
one of the best supportive services on campus . . . always willing to help.
doing a good job with a very difficult task, since many of your contacts are very "high-risk" students.
an essential part of the academic development and growth of SPC students.
a very helpful and necessary resource for SPC students and faculty.
a great resource for many students.
absolutely necessary to the community college philosophy and environment.
far too political on this campus.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 14 1992